Rosenberg v. Alliance Bancorp, et al., Court Case No. 1:17-ap-01096-VK

8

1

	U
	9
	10
	11
	12
S AT LAW	13
EYS AT	14
TORNEYS	15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Defendants Ocwen Loan Servicing, LLC ("Ocwen"), Deutsche Bank
National Trust Company, as Trustee for Alliance Bancorp Mortgage Backed Pass
Through Certificate Series 2007-OA1 ("Deutsche Bank Trust"), and Mortgage
Electronic Registration Systems, Inc. ("MERS", collectively "Defendants")
hereby answer the Complaint ("Complaint") filed by Plaintiff Steven Mark
Rosenberg ("Plaintiff") as follows:

I.

### **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

#### Α.

#### THE PARTIES

- Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to admit 1. or deny the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 1 of the Complaint and, therefore, deny those allegations.
- Defendants admit the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 2 2. of the Complaint.
- Defendants admit the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 3 3. of the Complaint.
- Defendants contend that Plaintiff has misconstrued the facts contained 4. in the allegations in paragraph 4 of the Complaint and on that basis deny.

#### JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- This paragraph does not contain any facts, but consists of legal 5. argument and as such does not call for an admission or denial.
- 6. This paragraph does not contain any facts, but consists of legal argument and as such does not call for an admission or denial.
- 7. This paragraph does not contain any facts, but consists of legal argument and as such does not call for an admission or denial.

28 ///

24

C.

#### PROCEDURAL AND FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- 8. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 8 of the Complaint and, therefore, deny those allegations.
- 9. Defendants admit the truth of the allegations contained in lines 13 through 18 of paragraph 9 of the Complaint, but are without knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny the truth of the allegations contained in lines 19 through 21 of this paragraph and, therefore, deny those allegations.
- 10. Defendants admit that Assignments of Deeds of Trust were recorded in the Los Angeles County Recorder's Office. Defendants contend that the allegations contained in lines 5 through 7 consist of legal argument, and as such do not call for an admission or denial.
- Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to admit 11. or deny the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 11 of the Complaint.
- 12. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 12 of the Complaint.
- Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 13 of the 13. Complaint.
- Defendants admit that Plaintiff commenced a probate petition in the 14. Los Angeles County Superior Court on August 27, 2009.
- 15. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 15 of the Complaint.
- 16. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 16 of the Complaint.

///

27 ///

///



10

WRIGHT FINLAY&ZAK"

25

D.

#### THE DEED OF TRUST IS VOID AB INITIO BASED ON FORGERY

- Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 17 of the 17. Complaint.
- 18. Defendants admit the allegations contained in paragraph 18 of the Complaint.
- 19. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 19 of the Complaint that Isadore Rosenberg's name was forged on the Promissory Note and Deed of Trust that are the subject of this litigation.
  - Defendants contend that the facts speak for themselves. 20.
- Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 21 of the 21. Complaint.
- 22. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 22 of the Complaint.
- 23. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 23 of the Complaint.
- 24. This paragraph does not contain any facts, but consists of legal argument and as such does not call for an admission or denial.
- 25. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 25 of the Complaint.

E.

### ASSIGNMENTS MADE BY ALLIANCE BANCORP, INC OF DEED OF TRUST ARE VOID

- 26. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 26 of the Complaint.
- 27. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 27 of the Complaint.

6

1

9

13

WRIGHT FINLAY&ZAK"

17

21

19

23

- Defendants are presently without knowledge or information sufficient 28. to admit or deny the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 28 of the Complaint.
- 29. Defendants are presently without knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 28 of the Complaint.
- 30. This paragraph does not contain any facts, but consists of legal argument and as such does not call for an admission or denial.
- 31. This paragraph does not contain any facts, but consists of legal argument and as such does not call for an admission or denial.
- 32. This paragraph does not contain any facts, but consists of legal argument and as such does not call for an admission or denial.
- This paragraph does not contain any facts, but consists of legal 33. argument and as such does not call for an admission or denial.
- This paragraph does not contain any facts, but consists of legal 34. argument and as such does not call for an admission or denial.
- 35. This paragraph does not contain any facts, but consists of legal argument and as such does not call for an admission or denial.
- This paragraph does not contain any facts, but consists of legal 36. argument and as such does not call for an admission or denial.
- 37. This paragraph does not contain any facts, but consists of legal argument and as such does not call for an admission or denial.
- 38. This paragraph does not contain any facts, but consists of legal argument and as such does not call for an admission or denial.

F.

### VIOLATIONS OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL CODE SECTION 2924.17

- 39. Defendants contend that the statute speaks for itself.
- 40. Defendants contend that the statute speaks for itself.

2
3

# 4

5

# 6

# 8

7

### 9 10

# 11

# 12

# 13 14

## 16 17

15

## 18 19

# 20

21

# 22

23

# 24

25 26

27

28

- 41. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 41 of the Complaint.
- 42. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 42 of the Complaint.
- 43. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 43 of the Complaint.
- Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to admit 44. or deny the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 44 of the Complaint.
- This paragraph does not contain any facts, but consists of legal argument and as such, does not call for an admission or denial.
- 46. This paragraph does not contain any facts, but consists of legal argument and as such, does not call for an admission or denial.
- 47. This paragraph does not contain any facts, but consists of legal argument and as such, does not call for an admission or denial.
- 48. This paragraph does not contain any facts, but consists of legal argument and as such, does not call for an admission or denial.
- 49. This paragraph does not contain any facts, but consists of legal argument and as such, does not call for an admission or denial.

#### GROUND FOR THE INSTANT ACTION

- 50. This paragraph does not contain any facts, but consists of legal argument and as such, does not call for an admission or denial.
- This paragraph does not contain any facts, but consists of legal 51. argument and as such, does not call for an admission or denial.
- 52. This paragraph does not contain any facts, but consists of legal argument and as such, does not call for an admission or denial.
  - 53. Defendants contend that the Rule speaks for itself.
  - 54. Defendants contend that the Rule speaks for itself.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28



55.	This	paragraph	does	not	contain	any	facts,	but	consists	of	lega
argument ar	nd as s	uch, does n	ot call	for	an admis	sion (	or deni	al.			

- 56. Defendants contend that the Rule speaks for itself.
- 57. This paragraph does not contain any facts, but consists of legal argument and as such, does not call for an admission or denial.
- 58. This paragraph does not contain any facts, but consists of legal argument and as such, does not call for an admission or denial.
- This paragraph does not contain any facts, but consists of legal 59. argument and as such, does not call for an admission or denial.
- This paragraph does not contain any facts, but consists of legal 60. argument and as such, does not call for an admission or denial.

### **FIRST CLAIM**

## (Against All Defendants for Violation of 11 U.S.C. §524(a)(2) – Debtor **Discharge Injunction**)

- Defendants re-allege and incorporate by reference the allegations set 61. forth in paragraphs 1through 60 of this Answer, as though set forth fully herein.
- Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 62 of the 62. Complaint.
- 63. This paragraph does not contain any facts, but consists of legal argument and as such, does not call for an admission or denial.
- 64. This paragraph does not contain any facts, but consists of legal argument and as such, does not call for an admission or denial.

### SECOND CLAIM

# (Against All Defendants for VIOLATION OF FRBP, Rule 3001(c)(2)(B); Failure to File Proof of Claim re Security Interest Statement of Amount to **Cure Default as of Petition Filing Date)**

65. Defendants re-allege and incorporate by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1through 64 of this Answer, as though set forth fully herein.

27 28

### (Against All Defendants for Violation of 18 U.S.C. §157-Re Fraud)

Defendants re-allege and incorporate by reference the allegations set 75. forth in paragraphs 1through 75 of this Answer, as though set forth fully herein.

The Complaint and each purported claims set forth therein, fails to state facts sufficient to constitute a viable and proper claim for relief against these answering

### SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFNESE

### (Statute of Limitations)

The Complaint and each purported claims set forth therein is barred by the applicable statute of limitations.



25

26

27

28

2

4

5

3

6

7 8

9

10 11

12

13 14

Wright Finlay&Zak"

15 16

> 18 19

17

20

21 22

23 24

25 26

27

NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Direct and Proximate Result of Other Parties)

Defendants are neither liable nor responsible to Plaintiff herein for the alleged damages or injuries to Plaintiff, if any whatsoever, because any damages or injuries sustained by Plaintiff herein were the direct and proximate result of the independent, intervening negligence and/or intentional conduct of Plaintiffs and other parties or their agents.

NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Defendants Acted in Good Faith)

Defendants are excused from any and all liability under the facts alleged in Plaintiff's claims for relief because at all material times Defendants acted in good faith and conducted all material transactions in good faith.

### TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Assumption of Risk)

Plaintiff, at all material times, calculated, knew and understood the risks inherent in the situations, actions, omissions and transactions upon which they now base their various claims for relief, and with such knowledge, Plaintiff undertook and thereby assumed such risks and is consequently barred from all recovery by such assumption of risk.

### ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Justification)

The Complaint and each alleged claim contained therein fails to state any claim against Defendants in that any purported conduct of Defendants was justified.

TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(No Violation of 11 U.S.C. §524(a)(2))

Defendants did not violate 11 U.S.C. §524(a)(2).

28

11

Rosenberg v. Alliance Bancorp, et al., Court Case No. 1:17-ap-01096-VK

Case 1:17-ap-01096-VK

Doc 9

Filed 12/29/17

Entered 12/29/17 15:27:08

### **PROOF OF SERVICE**

I, Marilee V. Johnson, declare as follows:

I am employed in the County of Orange, State of California. I am over the age of eighteen (18) and not a party to the within action. My business address is 4665 MacArthur Court, Suite 200, Newport Beach, California 92660. I am readily familiar with the practices of Wright, Finlay & Zak, LLP, for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service. Such correspondence is deposited with the United States Postal Service the same day in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

On December 29, 2017, I served the within **DEFENDANTS' ANSWER TO COMPLAINT** on all interested parties in this action as follows:

[X] by placing []] the original [X] a true copy thereof enclosed in sealed envelope(s) addressed as follows:

### [SEE ATTACHED SERVICE LIST]

- [X] (BY MAIL SERVICE) I placed such envelope(s) for collection to be mailed on this date following ordinary business practices.
- [] (BY PERSONAL SERVICE) I caused personal delivery by ATTORNEY SERVICE of said document(s) to the offices of the addressee(s) as set forth on the attached service list.
- (BY FACSIMILE) The facsimile machine I used, with telephone no. (949) 477-9200, complied with California Rules of Court, Rule 2003, and no error was reported by the machine. Pursuant to California Rules of Court, Rule 2006(d), I caused the machine to print a transmission record of the transmission, a copy of which is attached to the original Proof of Service.
- [] (BY FEDERAL EXPRESS OVERNIGHT- NEXT DAY DELIVERY) I placed true and correct copies thereof enclosed in a package designated by Federal Express Overnight with the delivery fees provided for.

	Case 1:17-ap-01096-VK Doc 9 Filed 12/29/17 Entered 12/29/17 15:27:08 Desc Main Document Page 15 of 16
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>[X] (CM/ECF Electronic Filing) I caused the above document(s) to be transmitted to the office(s) of the addressee(s) listed by electronic mail at the e-mail address(es) set forth above pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P.5(b)(2)(E). "A Notice of Electronic Filing (NEF) is generated automatically by the ECF system upon completion of an electronic filing. The NEF, when e-mailed to the e-mail address of record in the case, shall constitute the proof of service as required by Fed.R.Civ.P.5(b)(2)(E). A copy of the NEF shall be attached to any document served in the traditional manner upon any party appearing pro se."</li> <li>[X] (Federal) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.</li> </ul>
9	Executed on December 29, 2017, at Newport Beach, California.
110   111   112   113   114   115   116   117   118   119   120   121   121   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131   131	Maville V. Johnson  Marilee V. Johnson
22	
23	
24	
25	
27	
8	2
	PROOF OF SERVICE

1	ATTACHED SERVICE LIST
2	Steven Mark Rosenberg
3	15814 Septo Street
	North Hills, CA 91343
4	Plaintiff Pro Se
5	Kristin Webb, Esq.
6	BRYAN CAVE LLP
7	3161 Michelson Drive, Suite 1500 Irvine, CA 92612
8	(949) 223-7000; FAX (949) 223-7100
9	webbk@bryancave.com
10	Attorney for Cit Bank, N.A.
11	Amy L. Goldman (TR)
	633 W. 5 <sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 4000
12	Los Angeles, CA 90071 (213) 250-1800
13	Trustee
14	
15	United States Trustee (SV) 915 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 1850
16	Los Angeles, CA 90017
17	(213) 894-6811
18	U.S. Trustee
19	Judge Victoria S. Kaufman
20	U.S. Bankruptcy Court – Central District (San Fernando Valley)
21	21041 Burbank Blvd.
22	Woodland Hills, CA 91367-6603
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	PROOF OF SERVICE
- 1	

Case 1:17-ap-01096-VK Doc 9 Filed 12/29/17 Entered 12/29/17 15:27:08 Desc Main Document Page 16 of 16